



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

after experience as a school-teacher, entered journalism, serving successively on the editorial staffs of the *St. Thomas Journal* (1867-1879), the *Toronto Globe* (1879-1880) and the *Toronto World* (1880-1881).

"In 1881 Mr. Blue organized the Ontario Bureau of Industries of which he was Secretary from 1882 to 1891. In this capacity he instituted the useful agricultural statistics and crop reports of the Ontario Department of Agriculture, preparing for nine years the annual reports thereon. From 1884 to 1891 he was Deputy Minister of the Ontario Department of Agriculture and from 1891 to 1900 Director of the Ontario Bureau of Mines. Appointed in 1900 by the Hon. Sydney Fisher, then Canadian Minister of Agriculture, as Chief Census Commissioner, Mr. Blue conducted the Fourth Census of Canada in 1901 and wrote the elaborate introductions to the reports of that Census on natural products and manufactures. On the organization of the present Census and Statistics Office in 1905, Mr. Blue was appointed Chief Officer, and the Northwest Census of 1906, as well as the Fifth Census of 1911, were carried out under his general direction. In 1908 he instituted the present system of agricultural crop-reporting for the Dominion and started the *Census and Statistics Monthly*.

"In 1888 Mr. Blue served as a member of a Commission appointed to inquire into the mineral resources of Ontario, and he was a delegate to the Deep Waterways Convention of 1894. In 1908 he was elected as an Honorary LL.D. of McMaster University at Toronto; and he was a representative of Canada at the General Assembly of the International Agricultural Institute, held at Rome, Italy, in December, 1909, when he presented the paper on Crop-Reporting in Canada which was published in the *Census Monthly* of February, 1910. In February of the present year he was elected as an Honorary Member of the American Statistical Association on the occasion of the celebration of its Seventy-fifth Anniversary.

"Wielding a vigorous and facile pen, Dr. Blue, during a long, strenuous, and useful career as public servant, was the author of numerous articles ranging over statistical and economic subjects, whilst his genial and unassuming disposition secured for him widespread friendship and esteem."

J. K.

THE AGRICULTURAL CENSUS OF 1910.

The last census is the result of the greatest expenditure of money, and the employment of the greatest number of scientific experts thus far devoted to any one statistical inquiry in the country. It has been called "a college man's census." The director was a man of scientific training and years of scientific experience. One of the first moves of the director after assuming his new duties was the calling together of experts to aid in determining the plans and scope of the census and the formulation of the schedules to be used by the enumerations. The wisdom of this method of procedure can hardly be called in question, yet the conservatism lurking in a government bureau, even under a new director, is such that innovations are with difficulty inaugurated. In this case a very large part of the good

advice of the experts was rejected at the last moment and the schedules put back into the forms agreeable to a few men not too familiar with the facts of agriculture.

In the main the agricultural schedule of 1910 is very similar to that of 1900 but materially more elaborate. This further elaboration of preceding schedules has long been in progress. For example, a maximum of forty-eight questions were asked of each farmer in the census of 1860, and twice that number sufficed for the "Domesday" inquiry of 1880. In 1900 a total of 306 questions were included in the schedule, while in 1910 the number had grown to 560. That this latter number is too great is the belief of substantially everyone from director down to enumerator concerned in the census work. Nevertheless, the information asked for is, almost without exception, of much value. The difficulty was to get it, for even with the most painstaking care in the matter of instructions to enumerators many of them failed to comprehend what was wanted. Worse yet, many farmers felt that it was an imposition to ask them to answer in such minute detail questions on which they had little accurate information. For instance, a farmer was usually interested in reporting the acreages of grain and hay, the yields of the same, the number and value of livestock, but he was likely to lose interest, and incidentally faith in the census, when asked to report on the quantity and value of vegetables raised in his kitchen garden.

Back of the work of the Census Bureau in taking the census are several matters over which Congress has control and which need attention. The weakest factor in the whole census group is the enumerator. Here is work requiring expert knowledge and experience to be done by a vast army of inexperienced people, employed for a single month, at a wage not attractive to responsible and capable workers in any but exceptional cases. This difficulty can probably not readily be remedied so long as we continue to take the census within a given month during the spring or early summer. On the other hand there is in each congressional district a "supervisor of the census" who has it within his power to correct many of the evils due to the shortcomings of the enumerator. This supervisor is, due to the exigencies of politics, not appointed by the director of the census. He is virtually appointed by the congressman from the district. This precludes, in the great majority of cases, the possibility of expert supervision. As a result, a great many errors which could quite readily be checked up and eliminated by a competent supervisor, pass on to the Census office where correction is more difficult and in many cases impossible.

Another matter over which Congress has control is that of the time of year for taking the census. Surely the change from June 1 to April 15 was not made in the interest of agriculture however favorable it may be for other branches of the work. With respect to crops of the preceding year, the change made little difference; for the question as to crop acreages for the census year April is distinctly less favorable than June. However, it is in the very important matter of livestock that the worst results are to be noted. One of the main values of census figures is for comparisons

which are made possible, comparisons of like facts for different dates. The status of the livestock situation on April 15 is essentially unlike that of June 1. During this period, within a large part of the country, the greater number of young are born. Moreover, the number of colts, calves, and pigs raised during a given year shows as nothing else can the status of the livestock industry with respect to future prospects. These facts are wanting and the value of the thirteenth census in much less than it otherwise would be. Every friend of the agricultural census work should exert his influence to have the time of the census taking changed once more. The most favorable time would undoubtedly be after the work for the year is substantially over and before the occupier of the farm has moved to his next holding. Over one sixth of the American farmers move each year, and it is difficult, often impossible, to get statistics for the farm after the farmer has moved away. Taking the census in the early winter would give the best possible results as to crops grown, animals raised, land tenure, farm mortgages—in short, for substantially the entire schedule.

Congress played a poor rôle in the management of the census finances during 1910 to 1912. A fairly liberal appropriation was made for the taking of the census. However, some important stipulations were made necessitating unusually large expenditures. The work went on, and the expiring congress saw that more money was to be needed in order that the vast amount of information contained on the schedules might be made available. However, it was decided that money enough for the time intervening between that time and the meeting of the next congress was all that was imperatively needed. The next congress was of a different political complexion and indisposed to show much consideration for the unfinished work of its predecessor. Hence the census was left stranded between two ports either of which would have been welcome and either of which should have offered the required help. Trained clerks were discharged and work under way was abandoned. As a result, money was ultimately wasted, and some of the most interesting and valuable of the statistics are aging on the census shelves.

In spite of all discouragements and mistakes the agricultural census of 1910 is the best yet published. It contains the most information, and by all means presents it in the most available shape. The general report is confined to one volume. In this is to be found the leading facts classified under twelve headings, viz: Farms and Farm Property, Farm Tenure, Farm Mortgages, Statistics of Farms by Race Nativity and Tenure, Size of Farms, Livestock on Farms and Elsewhere, Livestock Products and Domestic Animals Sold or Slaughtered on Farms, Summary for All Crops, Individual Crops, Agricultural Statistics by Counties, Irrigation, Plantations in the South. An appendix treats of the physical features and soils of the United States. With the exception of one chapter the facts are presented by states only. In the chapter giving county figures the statistics of several preceding chapters are shown, the difference being in the matter of detail. The tables in this volume are a distinct improvement over similar tables in former volumes. In addition to text and tables an

elaborate series of maps is presented showing the geographical distribution of substantially every species of farm property and product.

The more detailed information is published in two volumes made up of state bulletins. These volumes are very usable. The state is accurately described as to soil; the leading statistics are presented in a series of small state tables accompanied by suitable text; detailed statistics are given by counties. So far as possible comparative figures from preceding censuses are given in the state tables. All in all it will be less frequently necessary to turn from one census report to another in making comparisons than has heretofore been the case.

A unique feature of the publications is the combining of each of the state bulletins with the Statistical Abstract of the whole census for use in the respective states. This gives to a great number of people all the information desired and saves sending out the complete volumes where this combination serves the purpose as well or better.

Statistics according to age of farmer; much information concerning rented farms; and the same for mortgaged farms are three items of importance on which the census bureau still has the unpublished facts. These are facts which should be made available, no doubt they will be, but the longer they are in appearing the less will be their value.

It is to be hoped that a more satisfactory and less expensive method of gathering agricultural statistics may be devised. Making use of the rural mail carriers has been suggested, and the suggestion merits consideration. It may be found feasible to specialize, as it were, with respect to inquiries made at a given time, putting the emphasis on one subject at one census and on something different at another. There is good reason to believe that our agricultural census figures are reasonably reliable. What is needed is greater facility in gathering them, and much greater speed in preparing them for use.

B. H. HIBBARD.

University of Wisconsin.

THIRTEENTH CENSUS OF THE UNITED STATES—MANUFACTURES, 1910.

Volumes VIII, IX, X, Census Office, Washington, D. C.

The statistics of Manufacturers for the Thirteenth Census of the United States constitute three of the twelve volumes (including the Abstract) of the Report. Volume VIII is entitled "General Report and Analysis"; Volume IX, "Reports by States, with Statistics for Principal Cities"; and Volume X, "Reports for Principal Industries." Volumes IX and X contain essentially the same data that are found in Volume VIII, but treated in more detail, and arranged either primarily by states and cities, or by industries.

The data presented were collected for the most part by special agents appointed for that purpose. In remote districts the population enumera-